DEBATE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 27-In continuation. The House having under consideration the following resolution, offered by Mr. Burt, viz:

Resolved, That the Speaker do now appoint the standing

nittees of the House. And an amendment proposed thereto by Mr. SACKETT, that the committees be appointed by the House under the pro-

visions of the seventh rule of order—

Mr. ROOT begged leave to say to his friend from New York (Mr. SACKETT) that he was rather too late in the day ; that he should have thought of his proposition when they were adopting the system of plurality vote. The Speaker was not in the chair by his (Mr. R.'s) vote; but that he was there by the votes of his political friends, with the connivance of his political enemies, and that he was confirmed there by the vote of both friends and enemies. He (the Speaker) had been placed there by the majority of the House—by a larger majority than any Speaker had received since he (Mr. R.) had been a member of this body; and he (the Speaker) no doubt regarded the resolution of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. Stanly) as his best title to his seat. Now, a Speaker thus elected and thus confirmed, might certainly, in his (Mr. R.'s) humble opinion, be trusted with the appointment of the committees. If gentlemen had any difficulty, any scruples in vesting the appointment of the committees in the Speaker, they should have thought of it before; it now came with a bad grace; he (Mr. R.) would never so distrust the Chair. If any candidate for the Speakership were presented who was not competent to discharge the high duties of the Chair, he (Mr. R.) would not vote for him; and he might have sufficient reasons for voting against him on other grounds than that of competency. But, after making a Speaker by a vote so nearly unanimous—with about thirty dissenting votes—all the rest of the House saying that the Speaker was there right-

er of the appointment of the committees of the House.

Mr. GIDDINGS said he rose simply to carry still further
the views to which his colleague had alluded. He saw that through the Taylor papers of the North the Free-Soilers were charged with electing the present Speaker. He desired to say to the House and to the country that the Speaker held his seat as a resulting consequence of the plurality rule, which was forced upon the House by most of the Whig party, aided by a small portion of those belonging to the other side of the House. Every reflecting man must have foreseen that result—at least it appeared so to him. All were conscious that 116 members held their seats by aid of Democratic votes. There were 114 only elected by aid of Whig votes. Of these, two were absent, (Mr. King of Georgia and Mr. GENTRY, leaving but 112 who had been elected by aid of Whig votes. Those, therefore, who voted for the plurality rule must have clearly foreseen the result. He had himself pointed many

ly, that he was the most proper man to be there, the Hous

would present themselves in a strange and ridiculous position if they now took away from the Speaker thus elected the pow-

the Whig party to it.

Mr. WHITE inquired if the gentleman's sagacity could point out any other mode of organizing the House than by the

Mr. GIDDINGS replied that the Whig party had it in their power at any time to elect the gentleman from Pennsylvania, on the opposite side of the House, (Mr. STRONG,) or any other Democrat known to be in favor of the proviso or they could have elected any Northern Whig who was openly committed to that measure. He had himself, and other Free-Soilers had, voted for the gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. STEVENS,) and had the Whig party united oon him he would have been elected on almost any ballot.

Mr. SCHENCK desired the floor to ask a question. He wished to inquire of his colleague whether he had not an opportunity to vote for a Northern Whig who was committed t

Mr. GIDDINGS said, certainly; he did so when he voted for the gentleman to whom he had alluded.

Mr. SCHENCK desired to inquire whether he had not an opportunity of choosing between the Whig nominee and the gentleman who was elected '

Mr. GIDDINGS said he regretted that his colleague (Mr. SCHENCK) had pressed this question upon him. He had not intended to make personal allusion to the honorable gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. Winthur,) who had formerly occupied the chair. But his colleague had pressed him into a position which compelled him to refer to that gen-tleman, which he intended to do with perfect respect.

It was known to the House and to the country that on the assembling of Congress in 1847 he and two other gentlemen, who, with himself, had previously acted with the Whig party, refused to vote for the gentleman at that time nominated by the Whigs. A learned and honorable gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. Palerer,) with his approbation, had propounded to the candidate interrogatories concerning the policy which he would pursue in relation to certain committees of this body, if elected. The gentleman refused to answer the interrogatories, but referred to his past acts and votes as proof of his future course. These were not satisfactory to him, nor to his two friends, and they declined voting for him. He was, however, elected, and presided in this body for two sessions of Congress. He said his colleague now asks if he did not know that that gentleman was in favor of the Wilmot roviso? Let his official acts answer the question. They stool on record. The Committee on Territories arranged by the Speaker had refused to report a bill containing the provise, until peremptorily ordered to do so by a vote of the House.

Mr. ROCKWELL asked of the gentleman from Ohio in-

tended to say that the Commisee on Territories refused to report a bill containing the provisions of the act of 1787? Mr. GIDDINGS said perhaps his anguage was too strong :

he should have said they neglected to port such a bill. The gentleman from Massachusetts then occopying the Speaker's chair had also refused to say what he would do in regard to so arranging the Committee on the District Columbia as to give expression to the sentiment of the entire vorth against

Mr. SCHENCK said his colleague had inferred om the arrangement of certain committees that the gentleman from Massachusetts was opposed to the proviso. He wished to quire whether his colleague did not know that that gentle nan had moved the proviso to the Oregon bill?

Mr. GIDDINGS called the House to witness that he had

not sought this personal controversy. But as his colleague had pressed him into this matter, he was compelled to enter upon a defence; and in making that defence, he would be constrained to refer to the gentleman from Massachusetts more freely than he had felt any inclination to do. It was true that the gentleman from Massachusetts had moved the proviso some years since to the Oregon bill; but, said he, men change their opinions and acts when raised to exalted stations. Before he should close his remarks, his colleague's either of those gentlemen, but would leave them, for the present to answered. He was referring, when last interrupted, to the arrange-

ment of the Committee on this District. That committee, during the last Congress, appeared to have been studiously arranged so as to protect the infamous commerce in human flesh carried on in this city. This committee had before them the petitions of the North. They had witnessed the heartrending scenes which transpired on the Avenue in the month of May, 1848, when that mournful procession of fifty-two slaves had been marched along that Court street of Washington by the great slave dealer, Hope H. Slatter. He made that statement, I rose and inquired of him if he meant could not say that they were personally present, and actually witnessed that revolting spectacle; but they soon knew all the disgusting facts, and so did the then Speaker. But not all these scenes, aided by the sentiment of the North, and bills containing that matter until they were instructed to do by the voice of humanity, could extort from that committeearranged as they were by the late Whig candidate for Speaker-a report against the slave trade, nor even a word of reproof against that traffic, for pursuing which on the eastern shore of the Atlantic we hang men as unsuited to human

But this was not all. The gentleman at the next session again formed the committee of nearly the same members. Indeed, he said, he did not recollect as there was any change. And the slave trade was again protected by that committee.

Now (said he) this same gentleman is again brought forward as the Whig condidate for Speaker, and gentlemen are again called on to choose between him and the gentleman now occupying the chair. He said God forbid that he should attempt to make a selection between them. He spoke with perfect respect for both those candidates; but he did not believe that a member on that floor, or a man in the whole country, had for a moment believed that he could be driven to sustain either of them. Yet one thing was quite certain. the present Speaker could do no worse than the former; and

there was a chance, a hope, that he might do better. He again repeated that he had not intended to enter into these personal explanations, involving the acts of other gentlemen; but the House would bear him witness that it had been forced upon him by his colleague. But he had now assigned some of the reasons why he had refused to vote for

Mr. WINTHROP desired, he said, only to say a few instructing the committee was adopted, upon the motion of words. He did not propose to go into any elaborate reply to my honorable friend from Ohio, (Mr. Roor.) But three the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio, (Mr. Gibbinos.)
He rather preferred to remind the House that a reply had already come from an honorable member on the other side—the the session was so early and the time had been so she gentleman from Tennessee, (Mr. Johnson.) The notes of the committees generally had not been called together by their that gentleman's speech had not yet died away, and he was respective chairmen. Few subjects had been referred to the quite sure the House and the country would bear in mind that he (Mr. W.) had been assailed upon the one side by the gentleman from Ohio, as having been most ultra in opposition an honorable gentleman from Iowa, instructing that committees. te every thing like free-soilism, in opposition to Northern sen- tee to inquire into the expediency of so dividing the Territory timent upon the subject of slavery; while, on the other hand, of Upper California as to organize and extend a distinct terrihe had been held up by the gentleman from Tennessee as havtorial government over that portion of said Territory which he had been held up by the gentleman from Tennessee as having in every respect gone against Southern views, and used the power and patronage of this House against them. Now he was quite willing to allow these counter statements, these counter speeches, to go out to the country to reply the one to

Mr. GIDDINGS, (interposing.) Does the honorable

man from Ohio, once for all, without intending any personal disrespect to the gentleman, that he did not design to answer his interrogatories. He had had quite too many of them—quite too much aside from any direct purposes, (he had almost used a stronger phrase, but he would not violate the courtesy of the House)—he had had quite too many of them to treat them with any great respect. He had seen a statement going the rounds of the papers over the signature of the gentleman from Ohio, which he was prepared to prove, which had been proved, to be without the shadow of foundation in fact. The honorable gentleman from Ohio had voted against him (Mr. W.) for Speaker two years since, and had come out in vindication of himself in the Ohio papers, and arrayed against him (Mr. W.) a fact, or what the gentleman arrayed against him (Mr. W.) a fact, or what the gentleman fact, which had not the shadow of truth. He (Mr. W.) dared say the honorable member believed it to be true; he did not impugn the gentleman's veracity, neither should oan from Ohio, once for all, without intending any pe called a fact, which had not the shadow of truth. He (Mr. W.) dared say the honorable member believed it to be true; fully supported them, as you, Mr. Speaker, well know, for he did not impugn the gentleman's veracity, neither should the gentleman tempt him (Mr. W.) to do it. But the gentleman had stated as a fact that which was not a fact; that which was utterly false. He had accused him (Mr. W.) of going into the Whig caucus at the time the war bill was be properly investigated by the committee. going into the Whig caucus at the time the war on the about to be passed in this House, and making a speech in favor of the war; and had placed his whole course of action against him (Mr. W.) as Speaker of the House upon that against him (Mr. W.) had testimony from gentlemen whom against him (Mr. W.) as Speaker of the House upon that ground. He (Mr. W.) had testimony from gentlemen whom the House would trust, and whom the honorable member the House would trust, amply sufficient to prove that an would be obliged to trust, amply sufficient to prove that an House. Thus far, sir, I agree with them in opinion. Actions of the House in the sufficient to prove that an would be obliged to trust, amply sufficient to prove that an interpretable to the sufficient to prove the sufficient to prove

in a speech had called upon his colleagues to go with him. The contended that the honorable member, having twice stated

that true or false

Mr. WINTHROP. I pronounce the whole statement false, that at that meeting, or at any other time, I made a speech in favor of the war. I pronounce the whole statement to be false.

Mr. GIDDINGS. I pronounce it to be true.

Mr. WINTHROP (resuming) said he would now proceed
to notice another statement which had been made this morn-

said that he had refused to vote for a Speaker who had sedulously composed the Committee on the District of Columbia with a view to uphold and maintain the slave trade in the District of Columbia.

Mr. GIDDINGS. I said that the gentleman had arranged

a committee which had sedulously maintained and protected it.

Mr. WINTHROP said he thought the House would bear him witness that the honorable gentleman had said that the Speaker of the last Congress had sedulously composed the Committee on the District of Columbia with a view to protect the slave trade in the District. But he took the statement as the slave trade in the District. But he took the statement as the statement as the state of the gentleman now made it, that he (Mr. W.) had arranged a committee which had sedulously upheld and maintained the on this floor. He should pass all that by, if these gentleme a committee which had sedulously upheld and maintained the slave trade in the District of Columbia. At the very last session of Congress the committee appointed by him (Mr. W.) had reported to this House a bill to abolish the slave trade in the District of Columbia; and when the motion was made to lay on the table, six out of the nine members who constituted nmittee had voted against laying it on the table. He (Mr. W.) had the impression that the bill was draughted by the gentleman from Mississippi, (Mr. Brown,) who was now in his seat. He remembered that that gentleman had risen and explained and vindicated the bill. It was a bill which had wen assented to by gentlemen on all sides of the House, by centlemen from the South as well as by gentlemen from the There were upon that committee five gentlemen from the North and four from the South. There were of the members of the House one hundred and forty from the free States and ninety from the slave States. He would leave it to the House and the country to judge how the proportions in the two cases corresponded.

But that committee did report a bill for that purpose; and,

in the face of that fact, the honorable gentleman from Ohio had risen and accused him (Mr. W.) with having (as the gentleman now made the statement) constructed a Committee for the District of Columbia which sedulously protected and upheld the slave trade in this District; and that the gentleman had assigned as his reason for voting against him.

Mr. GIDDINGS (interposing) said he understood the gen-

tleman from Massachusetts to have said that that comm reported a bill to abolish the slave trade in the District of Coumbia. There stood the record; and upon that record he (Mr. G.) pronounced that an utterly unfounded assertion. The record showed no such thing. The bill reported by that committee only prohibited the bringing in slaves from other States, but did not touch the traffic within the District. Mr. WINTHROP (continuing) said he confessed the dis-

tinction which the gentleman from Ohio took had not occurred to him as material to this case. It was possible the bill was nominated, the gentleman (Mr. Winthrop) had dedid not go quite as far as the honorable gentleman from Ohio clared his opinion at a Whig meeting in Massachusetts, and But by gentlemen upon all sides—at least by gentlemen from the free States—it had been regarded as a very great improvement upon any bill which had previously been reported to the His objection to the gentleman arose also from the fact that ment upon any bill which had previously been reported to the His objection to the gentleman arose also from the fact that House, and as being at least fair and equitable. He held he had gone for Texas, in a public toast at Faneuil Hall, that that was at least sufficient evidence—evidence which ought to have prevented the gentleman from Ohio from jections to that gentleman were also founded upon the acts of rising in his place and charging him (Mr. W.) with having sedulously constructed the committee, or (as the gentleman now viewed the charge) with having constructed a committee which sedulously protected the slave total and committee which sedulously protected the committee which sedulously protected th mittee which sedulously protected the slave trade in this District.

In concluding, he said that he had been betrayed into renases of much greater length than he had intended. 'He had not impded to allow the gentleman from Ohio to ruffle his feelings. He trusted he should very soon recover his ordinary proportion o calmness. There might come a time, in the course of the session, when he might feel more at liberty than setts nor the people of Massachusetts made the Wilmot pro-

sent, to answer each other.

Mr. ROCKWELL addressed the Rouse. He said: M. Speaker, the honorable gentleman from Ohio, (Mr. Gunnings,) in his remarks to the House this moning, said that ning, said that the Committee on the Territories, appointed by my honorable colleague (Mr. WINTHROP) at the last session of the last Congress, refused to report bills for the organization of territorisl governments containing the provisions of the ordinance of 1787, or, as he calls it, the Wilmot proviso, until they were instructed to do so by a vote of the House. When he to state that as a fact to the House and the country. In reply, the gentleman said that he would alter his phraseology, and would say that that committee neglected to report those so by the House: He then appealed to the record, and said, with an air of triumph, that it did and would stand upon that record, that that committee neglected that duty until they were instructed to perform it by the House : evidently intend ing to convey the idea that the committee neglected their duty in this regard for so long a period of time that the House was obliged to instruct them to do what the majority of that committee would not otherwise have done, viz: to report bills for territorial governments in New Mexico and California, containing the restrictions on the subject of domestic slavery which were part of the ordinance of 1787.

Sir, this representation on the part of the gentleman from Ohio touches not merely the conduct and policy of my col-league, the Speaker of that House, but also the character and fidelity of the members composing the majority of that com-mittee—their fidelity to principles well known to have been entertained by them, and to their constituents. For this reason I reply to that representation, as unfounded and unjust. Sir, I appeal to the record for proof undeniable of the incorrectness and injustice of his statements and insinuations. Here it is, sir, the Journal of the last session of the last Congress. By this record it appears that at the last session of Congress, which commenced on the 4th day of December, the standing committees were appointed on Thursday, the 7th of December-the Committee on the Territories among the rest. The House adjourned from that day until Monday the 11th. On Wednesday, the 13th day of December, the resolution legislative days had elapsed between the appointment of that committee and the passage of that resolution. The period in includes the white settlements in the vicinity of Salt Lake, Sir, the Committee on the Territories consisted of nine

members. The Journal shows that five of those nine mem bers voted for this resolution. Here are their votes, (reading from the Journal:) Nathan Evans, Daniel Gott, Iulius Rockwell, Caleb B. Smith, and James Thompson.

to them. The Journal be properly investigated by the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I will now direct my remarks to the que

the House would trust, and whom the honorable member would be obliged to trust, amply sufficient to prove that an entirely erroneous and unfounded statement.

Mr. GIDDINGS (interposing) desired respectfully to inquire of the gentleman from Massachusetts whether he intended to represent that his (Mr. Winthrop's) course upon the war question was the only objection he (Mr. G.) had taken to him as Speaker!

Mr. WINTHROP replied that he had only intended to remain the war question was the only objection he (Mr. G.) had taken to him as Speaker!

Mr. WINTHROP replied that he had only intended to remain the war question was the only objection he (Mr. G.) had taken to him as Speaker!

Congress, and from my knowledge of this House, I feel sure that any other mode of appointing the committees will be atmark that this was the principal burden of the gentleman's letter, that he (Mr. W.) had been a supporter of the Mexican war, and, in particular, that he had gone to the Whig caucus the morning on which the bill was introduced into this House, and mittees may be constituted, sir, they cannot entirely control the course of business and the policy of the House. The in a speech had called upon his colleagues to go with him. The gentleman from Ohio had made that charge in his first letter, which he (Mr. W.) had denied, and which had been proved to be without foundation in fact. The gentleman, he (Mr. W.) believed, had repeated that charge in a second letter after it had been denied. He (Mr. W.) denied it still; and he ter it had been denied. He (Mr. W.) denied it still; and he ter it had been denied. He (Mr. W.) denied it still; and he ter it had been denied. He (Mr. W.) denied it still; and he ter it had been denied. He (Mr. W.) denied it still; and he ter it had been denied. He (Mr. W.) denied it still is and he ter it had been denied. He (Mr. W.) denied it still is and he ter it had been denied. He (Mr. W.) denied it still is and he ter it had been denied. He (Mr. W.) denied it still is and he ter it had been denied. He (Mr. W.) denied it still is and he ter it had been denied. He (Mr. W.) denied it still is and he ter it had been denied. He (Mr. W.) denied it still is and he ter it had been denied. He (Mr. W.) denied it still is and he ter it had been denied. He (Mr. W.) denied it still is and he ter it had been denied. He (Mr. W.) denied it still is and he ter it had been denied. He (Mr. W.) denied it still is and he ter it had been denied. He (Mr. W.) denied it still is and he ter it had been denied. He (Mr. W.) denied it still is and he ter it had been denied. He (Mr. W.) denied it still is and he ter it had been denied. He (Mr. W.) denied it still is and he ter it had been denied. He (Mr. W.) denied it still is and he ter it he ter it had been denied. He (Mr. W.) denied it still is and he ter it had been denied. He (Mr. W.) denied it still is and he ter it had been denied. He (Mr. W.) denied it still is and he ter it had been denied. contended that the honorable member, having twice stated wors to elect a Speaker by a majority vote. We had exhaust what was untrue, and not having withdrawn it when it ed all reasonable effort. We were no nearer an organization what was untrue, and not having withdrawn it which it is that mode than when we first assembled. In my judgment the interests of the country and the opinions of our constitu mit the truth of the letter of E. D. Culver, of New York? Is knew it would effect an organization. There was but one practicable mode, as I believe, and that was adopted. We all knew it would effect an organization. The gentleman from knew it would effect an organization. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Giddings) has said that he knew that the result would be the choice of the present Speaker. I did not know that, for I did not know what would be the course of that gentleman and his friends. I believed then, as I know now, that it was in their power to secure the election of my honora-ble collesgue, (Mr. Winther.) There stands the unaltera-ble record: For Mr. Coss, of Georgia, one hundred and ing by the gentleman from Ohio. The honorable member had two votes; for Mr. Wintheop, of Massachusetts, one hundred votes. The gentlemen from Ohio (Mr. Giddings) knows full well whose votes were given for neither, and what

Mr. SCHENCK expressed the reluctance with which he took any part in this extraordinary debate; but he felt, as a Northern man and an Ohio man, that he could not longer remain without at least undertaking in a few words to definhis own position in relation to certain matters, whatever othe gentlemen might think proper to do. He had been accustom ed to hear the North lectured—the North told to "stand u and face the music"—the North spoken to by certain gentle confined themselves to mere general lectures; but when they went further, as his colleague had done this morning, and came went further, as his colleague had done this morning, and came before this House undertaking to misrepresent the position of other gentlemen, including himselt, (Mr. S.) he felt that he was called upon to repel every such misrepresentation made to the country. His colleague, before any interrogatory had been put to him, had volunteered the declaration that to the Northern Whigs of this House it was peculiarly owing that the present Speaker—a Southern gentleman—now occupied the present Speaker—a Southern gentleman—now occupied the chair. He had said, that if the Whig party had put up a candidate known to be in favor of the Wilmot proviso, he a candidate known to be in favor of the Wilmot proviso, he could have been elected in an hour; and thereupon he (Mr. S.) thinking his colleague's position untenable, had asked him why, if he was in favor of any Northern man who was a Wilmot proviso man, he had not taken the Northern man presented, who had always sustained the Wilmot proviso, but had contributed by his course to the election of a Southern Speaker? The gentleman had replied that he did not reconsist the cardidate of the White seats as the series in favor of gnise the candidate of the Whig party as being in favor of the Wilmot proviso. And how did he prove it? Did he refer to the fact that Mr. Winther formerly moved in this House to incorporate that provision of the ordinance of '87 into the Oregon bill' Had his colleague referred to the fact that Mr. WINTHROP had voted for that very proposition, when it was first christened the Wilmot proviso? Had he referred to the votes of that gentleman, and to his past course in this hall? Not so. His colleague had left years of legislation, of continuous consistent conduct, on the part of the gentleman from Massachusetts, out of view, and referred to the organization of the committees of this House at the last Congress in such a manner, his colleague had contended, a to uphold the traffic in slaves in this District.

Mr. GIDDINGS (Mr. Schenck yielding) explained that his objection to the gentleman from Massachusetts for Speaker was, that, after the present Executive of the United States

licy to adopt the Wilmot proviso.

Mr. ASHMUN. To whom does the gentleman refer?

Mr. GIDDINGS. To you. Mr. ASHMUN. I did not use any such language. Mr. GIDDINGS. The public have seen the language.

sident a man whose education, interests, and associations led him to oppose the Wilmot proviso.

Mr. SCHENCK, (resuming,) with a remark upon the Egression which his colleague had now made from the course of smark in which he was engaged, and a word of apology to Mr. Winther for seeming to undertake his defence, which would be done so much more ably by himself, briefly noticed and splied to some of the points just stated by his colleague. With reference to what his colleague had said concerning the course of the gentleman from Massachusetts in Whig caucus, they had he testimony of two gentlemen from Massachusetts on the other and, contradicting that charge of his colleague; and there he lett he gentleman, with two witnesses against him.

Then as to the charge of his college that the gentleman from Massachusetts had supported the annuation of Texas, from the beginning to the end, in every form, a the twentyeighth Congress, (when the measure was passed) the gen-tleman from Massachusetts had been found voting and acting against the annexation. Not so with the gentleman lam Indiana, (Mr. Brown,) for whom his colleague had voted. The votes of that gentleman were diametrically opposed t those of the gentleman from Massachusetts, and were with the

supporters of annexation. proceeded to notice the charge of his colleague base upon the composition of the committees of the last Congress, which, after all, he (Mr. S.) said, seemed to be the great charge of his colleague against the gentleman from Mass chusetts. Of the nine members of that committee at the firs session of the last Congress, five were from the free and four session of the slave States, and the same proportion was continued at the second session of that Congress—Mr. Brown, of Mis at the second session of that Congress-Mr. Brown, of Mississippi, being appointed in the place of Mr. McDowner, of Virginia, and Mr. GAINES, of Kentucky, in the place of Mr. SIMS, of South Carolina; and, after that change had taker place, the bill had been reported to put an end to the slave trade in the District of Columbia.

Mr. GIDDINGS. Does my colleague mean to say that

hat committee reported a bill to prohibit the sale and transfe

f human beings within the District of Columbia?

Mr. SCHENCK read the title of a bill, being a bill "to prohibit the introduction of slaves into the District of Colum bia for merchandise, sale, or hire." It might be, he said that that bill did not prohibit entirely the sale of slaves here in other words, that it did not abolish slavery in this District (for the one would be equivalent to the other.) It had been well said, however, by the gentleman for Massachusetts, that it did more than had ever been proposed by any bill in this House before. It was known by its title as a bill to abolish the slave trade in this District. It was so understood at the time; and, whatever the extent of its provisions, it accomplished mor than had ever been proposed by any committee of gentlement from the North and South. He referred to the records, show ing that Mr. HARALSON had moved to lay the said bill on the table, which motion was rejected by 117 nays to 72 yeas, and that among the nays were the names of six members of this ommittee, while the names of but two were in favor of the motion, (one member not voting.)

He proceeded to argue that the course of Mr. Winthrop, in the composition of the committees during the last Congress, could not have been the true reason for the opposition of his colleague to that gentleman, because his colleague had taken the

in which, with all due deference to his collect allowed widely to differ with him. The gen allowed widely to differ with him. The gentleman cared not what might be the past course of a man; he cared not for a life of consistency—a life illustrating the particular views he entertained in regard to great political questions. All this went for naught with him, and he preferred pledges made to order on the eve of an election to effect the purposes of the occasion. He (Mr. S.) thought differently. He cared very little, he cared not at all for pledges by which somebody was to be cheated. But he did care for a life marked upon the records of the country, without such temptations to influence him as were made use of to procure pledges from a candidate on the ever of election. didate on the eve of election.

He did not rest merely upon a priori reasoning in what he had said with reference to his colleague's position. He hoped to be excused for referring to facts which had recently taken to be excused for referring to facts which had recently taken place. Every body recollected how a certain bill to put a man in the chair, or to make himself Speaker, had been read a first and second time, and finally been lost upon its passage. Every body recollected the agreement which had taken place between two parties in this hall, and the position of their candidate. He begged the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Baown) to excuse him for this reference, because it became necessary to answer his colleague. The gentleman from Indiana stood upon the records for some two or three Congresses, voting directly opposite to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Winternor) on some of these questions. The gentleman (Mr. Brown) had been for the annexation of Texas; for stifling debate; for laying on the table and smothering resothe District of Columbia, and extending the ordinance of 1783; inc.

the District of Columbia, and extending the ordinance of 1787 over all the territories of the United States. These were the gentleman's votes, and his colleague (Mr. Giddinas) knew it; yet he had chosen to vote for the gentleman from Indiana upon a pledge of that gentleman, vamped up for the occasion, contradicting the tenor of his whole previous course. He (Mr. S.) had not much faith in these death-bed repentances. He had not much faith in these sudden conversions, and leas of all had he faith in them when they seemed to have been mad under the strong impulsive influence of a reward just ahead. He repeated that he was tired of hearing certain gentleme

assume to themselves to lecture the Whig party. Ther might be some propriety in it, if they had not entirely seps rated from the party; but, having done so, he must protes against the right of gentlemen, in a pharisaical spirit, to preach purity and good conduct to all the rest of the world assuming to be champions of all that was right and putting every body else in the wrong. This requiring of pladges showed that there were men at each end of the Union who would not vote for candidates who refused to give pledges of a sectional character—who would not vote for a Northern man because he was a Northern man, and who would not vote for a Southern man. vote for a Southern man because he was a Southern man What did this mean? If he took the position that he would not vote for a man because he was a Southern man, and another gentleman would not vote for a man because he was a Northern man, what did it amount to? It was disunion. They might cover it as they pleased—it was dis-union. It might perhaps be defined as but the first step to-wards disunion; but it was a step from which the conse-quence followed inevitably as fate. One section—the North or the South—must have the majority. Disfranchise all upor the other side, and the Union could not hold together a day it ought not to hold together a day. The Whig party, and some of the Democrats, differed from his colleague in this re-spect. They believed that this Union resulted from a compromise between the slave and the free States. They enter tained peculiar local sectional views, which education, habit association had forced upon them in reference to the question of slavery. He was in favor of the ordinance of 1787. He had always voted with the gentleman from Massachusett (Mr. Winthnor) in favor of it; yet he did not feel that upon this account he must stand here and claim to disfranchise every man living in the slave States because he differed with him on that local, sectional question. He had voted the other day, a part of the time, for Northern men, and a part of the time for Southern men. He had been willing to vote for any man whom he believed to be a conservative and a true Whig But, failing to elect such a man, and finding that, at both ex tremes of the Union, there were men who would stand ou impracticably "to the bitter end," unless the whole mass of the House consented to their peculiar views, he was one of those who had very reluctantly consented to the plurality sys tem as the only mode of organizing the House. He hoped h did his colleague no injustice when he said he knew the obsti

Mr. GIDDINGS, (in his seat.) You are right. Mr. SCHENCK (continuing) said, the gentleman the admitted that unless the House of Representatives came to him, the House could not be organized; but that he would prefer, in the language of the gentleman from Georgia, (Mr. Toomns,) "that disorder should reign forever," rather than that the House should be organized on any other ground that that which he chose. He (Mr. S.) did not feel thus. Be lieving it to be entirely constitutional, although, in other cir-cumstances, of doubtful expediency, he had voted for the plurality rule. He had not known, however, as his colleague had intimated, that the election of the present Speake would be the result. He had known that the organization o that, when the issue came between the present Speaker and the Northern Whig, who had not given pledges, but who was known to be right and sound upon all these questions— who, upon the record, had entertained the views generally entertained in regard to these sectional and local questions by the North-he had not known but that, when the issue was presented between these two gentlemen, some of his colleague' associates at least might be induced to take the gentle man from Massachusetts as a choice of evils, if he might be allowed the expression. But he had found that he was mistaken. These gentlemen had held out to the end, deter mined that the House should remain in a state of disorgani-zation unless the great mass of the House came to their im-

He thought there was no occasion for the fulminations they had heard here about disunion. He had been sorry to hear gentlemen take the position that they preferred at once to put an end to this Union rather than what they considered the present state of things should be enforced on the country. But he found a precedent for speeches of this sort. He read from a speech of Wendell Phillips, of Boston, delivered be-fore the National Anti-Slavery Society, the following extracts: "We confess that we intend to trample under foot the Constitution of this country; we call upon you to do likewise. Shall I tell you why? You can never make a revolution in this matter until you make the common sense and the consciences of the people superior to their statute-book; until you arraign against the despotism of the majority the conscientious convictions of the mass of the minority, whatever

Daniel Webster says you are a law-abiding people—that "Daniel Webster says you are a law-abiding people—that the glory of New England is that it is a law-abiding community. Shame on it, if this be true; if even the religion of New England sinks as low as its statute-book. But I say we are not a law-abiding community. God be thanked for it?"

"That is the error of American polities. We have forced the Democratic party out of the field, the original ally of the slave power. We have sent the Whigs into an alliance with Southern slaveholders. It is a natural alliance. It is the Lords of the Lash and the Lords of the Loom associated. It is the capital of the country and the conservation of the country the capital of the country and the conservatism of the country against the ideas of the country."

Mr. GIDDINGS inquired if the gentleman called Mr. Phil-

lips a Free-Soiler Mr. SCHENCK replied that he was an anti-slavery man a man who required the majority to come to the minority, and who declared if they did not, let disunion come, and disorder reign forever. Here we saw extremes meet. The Whig party, as charged by Mr. Phillips, were indeed the conservatism" of the country. Coming from the North

and com the South, representing every sectional interest, they acted together for the general good; for the maintenance of the rights and reterests of the whole. These rights and these interests he (Mi. S.) was ready to maintain, here and elsewhere, wherever his hand or his voice could do it, against these impracticable gentlemen.

Mr. HOLMES said, if this debate had not been very in structive to the House, it had been a potent manifestation to the country. What was the exhibition which had been made on this floor in this debate? A glorious emulation among the Northern men to show each for himself the utmost hostility to the institutions of the South; each gentleman endeavoring to defend his own vote upon the Speakership on the ground that he had gone as far as any other man to extend over the Territories that were shortly to come into this Union the Wilmot proviso; and that he had gone as far as any other for tion within this District, under the peculiar juris

diction of Congress, of that institution which gave vitality Mr. SCHENCK (interposing) explained that he had state that he was determined to separate himself from the influences of merely sectional and local feelings and views; and, in proof of that, he had voted one while with his party for a Northerz man, and one while with his party for a Southern man—not be lieving, as did his colleague, that this subject was far above

every thing else, even the union of the country.

Mr. HOLMES (resuming) said that one thing was no clearly manifest to the South, namely, that the representatives of the entire North on this floor had made up their minds to restrict the South in the occupancy of the new Territories which had been acquired by their common energies. There was also a manifestation, though it was spoken of in reference to the slave trade, that they were hostile to the existence of slavery in this District, and that they intended, whenever the power was in their hands, to exercise it, to destroy that institution which was now under the protection of this Government. He was delighted at this exhibition, because there were many of the South who had believed that there were

He (Mr. H.) had warned them that there was not a man in the North who was not hostile to the extension of their institutions, who would not compress, circumstribe, and keep us aroused to the ultimate destruction of slavery. He had warned them long ago. But, unfortunately, his powers had no proportion to his zeal. He had seen that there was an advance made by zealots upon the conservatism of the North, and that the whole body of the North were setting themselves in array against the South and would destruct the setting themselves in array against the South and would destruct the setting themselves. and that the whole body of the North were setting themselves in array against the South, and would destroy them, unless the South in time was warned and roused to maintain its proper position. He had heard the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Toomes) the other day speaking about disunion. He (Mr. H.) had no apprehensions of disunion. Why? Because, as Mr. Phillips had said, in the speech of which extracts had just been read, the lords of the loom, if gentlemen chose to call them so, were the natural allies of the lords of the "lash"—that the interests of the North were sliked with slave labor, and would sink to annihilation without its aid. But he had no apprehensions now, because, in the language of the South, after a long sleep, had risen up and shaken their invincible locks. They were aware of the danger of gradually circumscribing them within the folds of the serpent, to crush, with the influence and with the mighty strength of the boa, their energies and their life. He begged gentlemen not to mistake. He knew that the Union was safe, because the South was aroused; and if the gentleman from Ohio was not an enemy to the Union, as he charged upon his (Mr. H.'s) colleague that he was, let him tell the gentleman that the search the disappent is a search to the search that the sea H.'s) colleague that he was, let him tell the gentleman that the sooner he displayed his patriotism by the retraction of his avowal in favor of the Wilmot provise the quicker would be manifest his devotion to conservative principles. For sooner than the South would submit to have their institutions circumscribed, to have their feelings outraged and their chil-dren degraded, they would separate this Union as wide as the poles. Let not gentlemen be mistaken. The sentiments expressed on this floor the other day had gone on the wings

out which all that they owned and which they would transmit to posterity as a heritage, would have passed away.

Mr. GIDDINGS said no gentleman could regret more than himself that this debate should have been forced upon him. He had no intention of reading lectures to others, as his colleague (Mr. Schener) had intimated. He had come here tending to do his duty in a quiet and humble manner, so far as he was able; and when he had seen himself assailed through the Taylor press of the North, he felt it a duty to state in short some of the reasons which had constrained him state in short some of the reasons which had constrained him to withhold his vote from the honorable gentleman from Massachusetts. While previously on the floor he had assigned some of those reasons. But the honorable member from Massachusetts had seen fit, in his explanation, to refer to a vindication which he (Mr. G.) had published two years since. The honorable gentleman had referred to a fact which he had then stated, and in the heat of the moment had pronounced it fulse. He had intended to treat that gentleman, as he did all others, with respect; but he now felt bound to refer to the statement alluded to by that member.

It was known to the whole country that in the Presidential campaign of 1844 the entire Whig party had denounced the

roice that the Union, dear as it was, rich in its associations, embell-shed with all that could make it desirable, was nothing compared with the interests which were to them life—with-

It was known to the whole country that in the Presidential campaign of 1844 the entire Whig party had denounced the Mexican war, and no one had done so more zealously than himself. He was for withdrawing the troops from Mexico when the Whigs came into power here in 1847. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. WINTHROP) had, as he understood, in common with all other Whigs, denounted the war; and when the question was presented here in May, 1846, e changed his position and voted for it.

Mr. WINTHROP inquired if the gentleman intended to

my that he voted for the war?

Mr. GIDDINGS said he did intend to be so understood He intended to say that the gentleman did vote for the bill declaring war. This change of the gentleman's position con-

stitued one of his objections to him as a candidate for Speaker.

Mr. WINTHROP. I deny that I ever changed my position.

Mr. GIDDINGS resumed. But when he had given his Mr. GIDDINGS resumed. But when he had given his vote, he was at once assailed through all the Taylor papers of that day as a deserter from the Whig ranks. So general were these attacks that he felt constrained to publish a vindication of his vote. In writing out that vindication, he alluded to this change of position by the gentleman, and had stated that he advocated in a caucus the propriety of the Whig party voting for that bill. That he had also urged his colleggues personally to do so. And finally, that he had lessed leagues personally to do so. And, finally, that he had placed his vote in favor of the bill on record.

Mr. WINTHROP. I deny that I ever came out. Mr. GIDDINGS. Well, his organ did. Mr. WINTHROP. I have no organ.

Mr. GIDDINGS. Now, the gentleman says that that statement is false. Does he intend to deny that he voted for the bill? That was the very gist of the charge. It consti-tuted the very essence of his objection. It bore conclusive evidence of his change of opinion. There stands the record of that vote. No time can alter, no effort car crase it. It rill descend in all coming time, and will forever remain indubitable proof of the accuracy of the charge. The gentle-man, nor his friends, ever have or ever will deny it. But how does he now attempt to escape from it? Why, by saying nothing about it; by evading this important part, constituting the charge, and turning off to a collateral, to an immaterial matter, seeking to form an issue upon an incidental remark. Now, the gentleman is too good a lawyer to suppose that he can escape the charge brought against him by such an irregularity of special pleading. The evacion is too palpable that he had changed his mind. This change he has never denied, nor can he deny it. But he insists hat although he voted in favor of the war, which he and the whole Whig party had denounced, yet he did not urge his party in caucus to do it

Now, even as to these collateral matters which he says he roved by two colleagues, all they said or could say was, that they had no recollection of it; while an honorable gen-tleman from New York, E. D. Culver, had stated every fact to which he had alluded as within his distinct recollection. Other gentlemen had testified to parts of the conversation. He would here leave the gentleman from Massachusetts, as he

He said he had but a word in reply to the gentleman from Massachusetts behind him, on the left, (Mt. Rockwell.)

That gentleman was in error when he said that the committees were appointed on the 10th of December. They were appointed on the 7th of that month.

Mr. ROCKWELL. That is true. On Tlursday, the 7th December, the House adjourned over to Mo day. That resolution was introduced on Wednesday; but three legislative days had intervened.

Mr. GiDDINGS. There can be no doub about the fact. Mr. GIDDINGS. There can be no doub about an about when Congress assembled the country was anxious on this subject; all were looking to that committee, expecting a prompt report on this important subject. Such was the delay that my colleague (Mr. Roor) brought forward his resolution, peremptorily ordering them to report. This was all he had said. He left it to the country to say whether the delay was unreasonable. His colleague seemed to hink it was, and had therefore offered his resolution. Whether the House so thought or not, they passed the resolution, from which it would be fairly implied that they thought the delay was at least unne-

He said he had a word or two in reply to his colleague, (Mr. Schekek) That gentleman in 1847 was aware that he would never vote for the Whig candidate. He then knew is reasons; and he would add another fact, his colleague did not then denounce him.

Mr. SCHENEK (interposing) inquired if his colleague re-

ferred to a private conversation between them and another colleague Mr. GIDDINGS. No, st. Mr. GIDDINGS. No, sr.

Mr. SCHENCK (continuing) referred to what Mr. Grnpings had stated, and remeked that there was just so much
in it as made it liable to disconstruction; and he (Mr. S.)
should take care that that misconstruction was prevented.
His colleague knew that it that time the gentleman from
Massachusetts (Mr. Wingsnor) was not his (Mr. S.'s) first
choice for Speaker. His colleague knew that he (Mr. S.)

ntended to vote for any one who was the nominee of the Whig party. Mr. GIDDINGS said, & was stated by whalers that when death blow was given to those leviathans of the deep, they pecame dangerous in thir dving agonies. These expiring convulsions were called the flurries. He thought some gentlemen were in their flaries; but all he could do was, like the whaler, to cry "stars all," and to keep as far out of their

nomines was the arrangment of the committees, to which he had referred when last up. He had then stated some of the objections. He had not intended to go into these personal objections further than was absolutely necessary. They were matters to which he had felt great repugnance; but he now told his colleague that his objections were founded on the whole political course of that gentleman. He referred particularly to his Faneuil Hall toast on the 4th July, 1845, in favor of Texas, before Fexas was annexed. He referred to his motion to lay the resolution of Mr. Palfrey on the table, at a Whig Convention in that State, in the autumn of 1845. That resolution was designed to pledge that party in opposi-tion to any man as a candidate for President who was not pledged, by his acts or avowed opinions, against the exten-sion of slavery. These all entered into his estimate of that gentleman's character. He had also regarded the avowals of those gentlemen of influence who lead that party. He referred to the remark of that gentleman's colleague, at the Whig caucus held on the Saturday evening previous to the com-mencement of the present session, that the Whig party in Massachusetts did not make the support of the proviso a party test.
Mr. ASHMUN inquired which colleague

Mr. GIDDINGS replied, the one who now addressed him Mr. ASHMUN said he had not made that remark.

Mr. GIDDINGS resumed. He did not pretend to quo the language; he had intended to express the substance. The words had been published; he referred to them.

But his colleague had referred to the Whig party, and was willing to vote for any Whig. He was unwilling to be driven into any remarks relative to that party. But the House would bear him witness that this discussion was not his seeking. He was driven into it in self-defence. But he was con-

would bear him witness that this discussion was not his seeking. He was driven into it in self-defence. But he was constrained to say that the action of that party for the last year had been any thing but consistent.

On the 21st of December, 1847, he had presented to this House a petition from the people of this District, praying the abolition of the slave trade now carried on in this city, and moved its reference to the Committee for the District of Columbia, with instructions to report a bill agreeably to the prayer of said petition. A motion was made to lay his proposition on the table. Against this motion every Whig north of Mason and Dixon's line voted. The vote was such as he expected—such as did them credit. But mark the change. Just one year subsequently, the gentleman from New York, on his right, offered his resolution to instruct the same committee to report a bill abolishing the slave trade. It carried, and a motion was made to reconsider the vote by which it was adopted. That motion came up on the 27th of the same month, and the gentleman over the way from Illinois (Mr. Wentwoath) moved to lay the motion to reconsider on the table. On this they rallied their forces, as they regarded it the most favorable for a strong vote in favor of freedom. If carried, it would leave the resolution in force, and the bill to abolish that traffic would have come before them. But he would that every man in the nation could hear him. On that abolish that traffic would have come before them. But he would that every man in the nation could hear him. On that vote twenty-six Northern Whigs recorded their names against the motion, thereby lending their influence in favor of that disgraceful commerce in our own species. Sir, said he, Gen. Taylor had been elected, and these Northern Whigs, being a majority of that party who then voted against the motion, in the space of one year and six days, faced to the right-about—countermarched—changed their position on this subject.

Mr. G. said he wished just to state a fact in the most profound confidence. His colleague, who had just addressed the House with so much ability, was one of those who had thus suddenly turned a political somerset. expressed on this floor the other day had gone on the wings of the wind, and with the force of lightning, to the different sections of the South; and in what paper had there not been a response? The voice of the people, like the voice of many waters, had come up, declaring to their representatives on this floor that they must now assume the attitude of bold defiance to the circumscription of their rights in the Territories, to the abolition of slavery in this District, declaring with united voice that the Union, dear as it was rich in its expectations.

House with so much ability, was one of those who had thus suddenly turned a political somerset.

Mr. SCHENCK interposed, and said that his colleague spoke of Mr. Gorr's resolution. He (Mr. S.) was not here when that resolution was passed, having been called away by sickness in his family. If he had been here, he should have attempted to have had the resolution passed without the preamble, which he considered unnecessarily offensive to the people of the South. When the question on three consideration of the resolution came up, he had returned to this city. He voted against the motion to lay on the table; but he meant to move to reconsider, as one of his colleagues whom he had consulted knew, because he deemed it proper, if the resolution passed, (and he was in favor of the resolution,) that it should not be done in the offensive language of the preamble. If his colleague would read that preamble, he would see what its terms were.

Mr. GIDDINGS resumed. He said his colleague referred

Mr. GIDDINGS resumed. He said his colleague referred to he preamble of the resolution as offensive to the South. The allege there was any thing in that preamble that was not society true? And was he afraid that truth would be offensive? Again he asked his colleague if Southern gentlemen made any objections to the preamble? He believed the South had at all times been able to take care of them. selves. Indeed, he had generally found them able and willing to take care of the North also. But his colleague had volunto take care of the North also. But his colleague had volunteered to take them under his protection, to extend over these slaveholders a parental care. Why, (said he,) does he not see that he was going entirely beyond the slaveholders? that he out-Herods Herod? He was sensible that gentlemen could at all times find some excuse for keeping up this slave trade; such excuses had been found for the last forty years. Mr. VINTON interposed and said, that when the resolution was first offered by Mr. Gorr, that gentleman moved the previous question. He (Mr. V.) had then risen and said that he hoped the previous question would not be seconded, because, before the vote was taken, he desired to move to strike out the preamble. His colleague. (Mr. Gippings.) strike out the preamble. His colleague, (Mr. Giddings,) however, and a sufficient number of other members, voted for the previous question, which was sustained; thus cutting off a motion to strike out the preamble. As a matter of course, he (Mr. V.) had voted for the resolution. That vote had placed him in a false position; and he voted to reconsider, for the purpose of getting an opportunity of doing what he had originally avowed his intention to do, to move to strike out the preamble, which he considered offensive, but with the intention of voting for the resolution divested of the preamble. His colleague had held a conversation with him on the

merits of that preamble.

Mr. GIDDINGS said that he entertained no doubt that his colleague last up (Mr. Vinton) had felt that these slavehis colleague last up (Mr. Vinton) had felt that these slave-dealers ought to be treated with great delicacy. For his part, he had no such tender sympathies. We hang those who fol-low that commerce on the eastern shore of the Atlantic as un-fit for human associations, but his colleagues were for treating those more guilty with unusual delicacy. The name of his colleague last up also appeared on the Journal as voting against the proposition to lay the motion to reconsider on the table, and then as moving to postpone the subject for two weeks. He had at the time been unable himself to see any good rea-He had at the time been unable himself to see any good rea-son for the postponement. But he would return to the Whig party. It would be remembered that this change had taken place after the election of General Taylor, when gentlemen are sometimes suspected of being desirous of propitisting the

Mr. SCHENCK interposed, explaining what his action had been on Mr. Gorr's resolution. His colleague had charged him with a want of boldness in facing the truth. His colleague well knew that he was not afraid to avow his opinions in relation to slavery or the slave trade in the Disrict of Columbia. He (Mr. S.) dared to entertain opini upon those subjects which his colleague thought were very

unpopular at the North.

Mr. GIDDINGS claimed the floor. Mr. SCHENCK inquired whether his colleague would not

give him the opportunity to state his opinions.

Mr. GIDDINGS said he would bring his remarks to a close immediately. When last interrupted he was referring close immediately. When last interrupted he was referring to the fact that gentlemen were sometimes suspected of endeavoring by votes in this hall to propitiate Executive favor. He would not say that gentlemen voted on the occasion referred to for that purpose; but it was certain that one gentleman who then voted against laying the motion to reconsider on the table, thereby sustaining the traffic in our own species, had received an offer of a seat in the Executive Cabinet, but desired its Arether when the executive Cabinet, but desired its Arether when the second content of the second content of the content of the second content of the content clined it. Another who thus voted now presided over the Naval Department, and was one of the President's constitutional advisers. Another, who had not voted either way, was at the head of the Post Office Department; another was now our Minister at Madrid; another represented this nation at the court of the Grand Sultan of Turkey; snother was Commissioner on Mexican claims; another had been appointed Marshal of the Western District of Pennsylvania; another vas inspector of hospitals in the United States; and the sonn-law of another was chief clerk in the Home Department. He could not say that these rewards were given as compen-sations for sustaining the crimes connected with the slave trade; but it is an extraordinary fact that, so far as his knowtrade had received so much as a smile from the President. Yet he was told that an obligation rested on him to vote for the gentleman from Massachusetts, because he belonged to this party. He said that names had little weight with him.

He would be as willing to vote for a Democrat who protected the slave trade, as for a Whig who committed the same deeds. He would vote for no man who thus sustained a course at which humanity revolts. He would refer to a fact that transity. It was the week before the present session commenced Most of the old members would recollect a colored man who last year waited in the refectory below us. He, fearing that he was to be sold under your law, attempted to make his escape to a land of freedom. He was arrested, and knowing his doom, he drew a knife from his pocket, and, in the presence of his captors, cut his own throat, and appealed to the God of Justice against the law which has been sustained in this District for the last forty years. But such suicides are common among the victims of this traffic. He repeated that those who deal in slaves here are far more guilty than those who follow the African slave trade. Their victims are more

who follow the African slave trade. Their victims are more enlightened, and suffer more.

And one fact was certain; this slave trade had been sustained for the last two years by the Whig party of this House. The records of the nation showed this fact, and still gentlemen urged that he was bound to sustain a man for Speaker because he belonged to that party. He denied any such obligation. He would be as willing to go down to the slave pen on the corner of 7th street and Maryland avenue, and take the dealer in human flesh who presides over that nighting. on the corner of 7th street and Maryiand avenue, and take
the dealer in human flesh who presides over that piratical
establishment to officiate as Speaker of this House, as he
would vote for any man, call him Whig or Democrat, who
lends his influence to protect and shield that execuable traffic.
His colleague had spoken with contempt of pledges; but
insisted that he ought to have voted for a man who would not way as he could. [A largh.]
His colleague had saidthat his only objections to the Whig

let his views be known: that he should march up blindfolded to the work, and lend his efforts to elevate to the Speakership a man who, if he had any sentiments, dared not utter them. He spurned the degrading proposition. The very idea of the candidate's secreting his opinions was to cheat some portion of those who yoted for him. He knew that, if his sentiments candidate's secreting his opinions was to cheat some j of those who voted for him. He knew that, if his sent of those who voted for him. He knew that, if his sentiments were known, some would not lend him their votes. While he was himself unwilling to cheat or defraud others, he had no anxiety to be duped himself. He would never disgrace his constituents with such a vote. They had never voted for him without knowing his sentiments. They refused their support to General Taylor on this very principle. If other constituencies wish their representatives to be imposed upon by such device, his did not. He stood as an advocate for open, undisquiged, honest truth. disguised, honest truth.

disguised, honest truth.

His colleague and the gentleman from Massachusetts had said that a bill at the last session to abolish the slave trade here had been introduced by the Committee on this District. Gentlemen need not misrepresent recorded facts. There was no such bill introduced. That committee had introduced a